

## REMARKS

### STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claim 8 was rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 have been amended.

Claims 1-8 are pending and under consideration.

No new matter is being presented, and entry of the new claims is respectfully requested.

### REJECTION OF CLAIM 8 UNDER FIRST PARAGRAPH 35 U.S.C. § 112 FOR ALLEGEDLY FAILING TO COMPLY WITH THE WRITTEN DESCRIPTION

Claim 8 recites "a first computer ... storing a set of reactions available to the plurality of computers connected to said communication channel" at lines 3-5. The specification describes an embodiment in which the "[i]nformation detecting sections 102, 202 monitor information transmitted to common communication path 3, and retrieve information reaction tables 103, 203 upon detection of information, to judge whether a reaction, or response should be made to the information" on page 9 at lines 6-8. It is submitted that the "information detecting sections 102, 202 monitor information transmitted to common communication path 3" discussed on page 9 of the specification makes "available to the plurality of computers connected to said communication channel" a "set of reactions" as recited in claim 8 by "retriev[ing] information reaction tables 103, 203 upon detection of information, to judge whether a reaction, or response should be made to the information" and thus shows to one of ordinary skill in the art that the inventors were in possession of the what is recited in claim 8.

### REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-8 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY HAO ET AL. (U.S. 5,844,553) (hereinafter "Hao")

The rejections of claims 1-8 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

In the Response to Arguments on page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner dismissed the Applicant's arguments as moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. The new grounds cited by the Examiner fail to address all the features recited in independent claims 1, 2 and 7, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Hao disclosed a system, which "is event driven with agent assistance" (Abstract, lines 8-9) and that "processes the event then multicasts the event to the appropriate shared application

windows" (column 9, lines 50-52). The appropriate application window is identified in the files illustrated in column 12, lines 1-8 and lines 23-30. Hao also disclosed "a rotation motion can be conducted directly on window 112... [t]he rotation motion would then be captured and multicast to winds 112, 122 and 124... [e]ach application... would receive the motion event and operate on an associated local database" in column 5, lines 22-30. Thus, Hao predetermines the appropriate application window(s) to send an event before sending the event to the appropriate application window(s).

In contrast, independent method claim 1 recites "at the first computer, detecting the received indicia, which was received via the communication path, and determining whether the received indicia corresponds to at least one of the first set of reactions" (emphasis added) at lines 15-16. Nothing was cited or found in Hao that discloses a detecting and determining operation which occurs upon reception of received indicia. One skilled in the art would understand that Hao does not described such operations, since Hao sends "the event to the *appropriate* shared application windows" (emphasis added, column 9, lines 51-52) and thus preprocesses and determines the shared application window an event will be sent.

Therefore, it is submitted that, for the reasons submitted above, that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Hao and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 2 recites "detecting the received indicia, which was received via the communication path, and determining whether to react to each message based on each message's indicated operation type" at lines 8-9. It is submitted, for the reasons submitted above, that claim 2 and dependent claims 3-6, which depend therefrom and recite further patentable distinctions, patentably distinguishes over Hao and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 7 recites "detecting the received indicia, which was received via the communication path, and determining whether to react to each message based on each message's indicated operation type" at lines 8-9. It is submitted, for the reasons submitted above, that claim 7 patentably distinguishes over Hao and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 8 recites "a processor detecting when a transmitted indicia has been received from the communication path and determining when a operation will be performed on said first computer" at lines 7-8. For the reasons submitted above, it is submitted that claim 8 patentably distinguishes over Hao.

In addition, claim 8 recites "storing a set of reactions available to the plurality of computers connected to said communication channel for performance on said first computer" at lines 4-6. Hao disclosed a file that includes both local and remote operations at column 12 lines 1-8 and 23-30. It is noted that the scope column in both shown files have both "local" and "all" listed as possible values. Therefore, in addition to the reasons submitted above, it is submitted that claim 8 patentably distinguishes over Hao and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 5, 2007

By: David E. Moore  
David E. Moore  
Registration No. 59,047

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501